

# C/CAG

## CITY/COUNTY ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS OF SAN MATEO COUNTY

*Atherton • Belmont • Brisbane • Burlingame • Colma • Daly City • East Palo Alto • Foster City • Half Moon Bay • Hillsborough • Menlo Park  
Millbrae • Pacifica • Portola Valley • Redwood City • San Bruno • San Carlos • San Mateo • San Mateo County • South San Francisco • Woodside*

**1:15 p.m., Thursday, July 20, 2006**

**San Mateo County Transit District Office<sup>1</sup>  
1250 San Carlos Avenue, Second Floor Auditorium  
San Carlos, California**

### TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC) AGENDA

- |  |                   |               |
|--|-------------------|---------------|
| 1. Public comment on items not on the Agenda (presentations are customarily limited to 3 minutes).   | Cullen            | No materials. |
| 2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approved by CMAQ – Proceed with the Phase I Traffic Incident Management Plan Development</li></ul>  | Hoang             | No materials. |
| 3. Approval of the Minutes from June 15, 2006.   | Hoang             | Pages 1-4     |
| 4. Review of potential candidate projects for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) in the event that voters approve the Senate Bill (SB) 1266 - Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 | Wong              | Pages 5-9     |
| 5. Recommendation on the Revised Scoring Criteria to be used for future funding cycle  | Hoang             | Pages 10-12   |
| 6. Measure A Update (Strategic Plan development).  | Hurley            | Oral Report   |
| 7. Coordination With Caltrans Regarding Design Features On the El Camino Real  | Wong              | Pages 13      |
| 8. Member Reports.   | Cullen/<br>McAvoy |               |

---

<sup>1</sup> For public transit access use SamTrans Bus lines 390, 391, 292, KX, PX, RX, or take CalTrain to the San Carlos Station and walk two blocks up San Carlos Avenue. Driving directions: From Route 101 take the Holly Street (west) exit. Two blocks past El Camino Real go left on Walnut. The entrance to the parking lot is at the end of the block on the left, immediately before the ramp that goes under the building. Enter the parking lot by driving between the buildings and making a left into the elevated lot. Follow the signs up to the levels for public parking.

2006 TAC Roster and Attendance					
Member	Agency	Jan	Mar	Apr	Jun
Neil Cullen (Co-Chair)	San Mateo County Engineering	yes	yes	yes	
Ian McAvoy (Co-Chair)	SamTrans	yes	yes	yes	
April Chan	Peninsula Corridor JPB				
Duncan Jones	Atherton Engineering		yes	yes	yes
Fernando Bravo	East Palo Alto Engineering		yes		
Gene Gonzalo	CalTrans				
George Bagdon	Burlingame Engineering	yes			yes
Jon Lynch	Redwood City Engineering	yes	yes	yes	yes
Joseph Hurley	SMCTA	yes	yes	yes	yes
Kenneth Folan / M.Roddin	MTC				
Larry Patterson	San Mateo City Engineering	yes	yes	yes	yes
Liz Cullinan	San Carlos Planning	yes	yes		yes
Mark Duino	San Mateo County Planning	yes	yes	yes	
Meg Monroe	Burlingame Planning	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mo Sharma	Daly City Engineering	yes	yes	yes	yes
Parviz Mokhtari	San Carlos Engineering	yes	yes	yes	yes
Randy Breault	Brisbane Engineering	N/A	yes		
Ray Davis	Belmont Engineering	yes	yes	yes	
Ray Towne	Foster City Engineering	yes		yes	
Reza (Ray) M. Razavi	South San Francisco Engineering		yes		yes
Rick Mao	Colma Engineering	yes	yes		
Ruben Nino	Menlo Park Engineering	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sandy Wong	C/CAG CMP	N/A	yes	yes	yes
Tatum Mothershead	Daly City Planning	yes	yes	yes	yes
Van Ocampo	Pacifica Engineering		yes		yes

**TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE (TAC)  
FOR THE  
CONGESTION MANAGEMENT PROGRAM (CMP)**

**June 15, 2006  
MINUTES**

The one hundred sixtieth (160<sup>th</sup>) meeting of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) was held in the SamTrans Offices, 1250 San Carlos Avenue, San Carlos, Bacciooco Auditorium. Acting Co-Chair Hurley called the meeting to order at 1:25 p.m. on Thursday, June 15, 2006.

TAC members attending the meeting are listed on the Roster and Attendance on the preceding page. Others attending the meeting were: Richard Napier, Walter Martone, and John Hoang - C/CAG; Brian Lee – San Mateo County Public Works; Zachary Chop – Caltrans; Jim Bigelow – CMAQ; Randy Durrenberger – Kimley-Horn.

**1. Public comment on items not on the agenda.**

Sandy Wong introduced John Hoang as a new C/CAG Staff.

**2. Issues from the last C/CAG and CMAQ meetings.**

As shown on Agenda.

**3. Approval of the Minutes from April 20, 2006.**

Approved with correction. Meg Monroe made the correction that she was present at the last meeting.

**4. Recommendation on approval of the Revised Final Policy on Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) to determine impacts on the Congestion Management Program (CMP) roadway network resulting from roadway changes, general plan updates, and land use development projects.**

Sandy Wong presented the revised final policy for the Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) and indicated that the TIA subcommittee had addressed comments from Redwood City and Menlo Park on the last draft. The policy went back to the TAC for review and was then forwarded to the CMAQ for review and approval.

However, before the policy was presented to the C/CAG Board for final approval, additional concerns were raised by the City of Menlo Park. Staff has been working with the City of Menlo Park to reformat the Policy to include the following changes:

- Revised the definitions describing the three types of projects: 1) Roadway modifications; 2) General Plan and Specific Plans; and 3) Land use development project;
- Clarified that the TIA is not intended to satisfy CEQA requirements;

- Added language to separate long-term and short-term analysis indicating that a travel demand model must be used to determine long-term traffic impacts if the project will modify the CMP roadway. Short-term analysis is not required to use the Travel Demand Model but other analysis methods may be used, as listed in Section III of the Policy;
- Added language to the Land Use Development Projects Mitigations section to read “If physical mitigation is desired, the jurisdiction should determine whether the project can and should be required to construct the mitigation project or whether funding the project’s pro rata share is appropriate, and paid to the jurisdiction.” (Note: this change was omitted from the version included in the meeting packet.)
- Added statement with regards that if a jurisdiction regularly amend its General Plan to include Land Use changes but do not conduct overall General Plan updates, then the C/CAG Travel Demand Model will need to be run every two years instead at every minor amendment.

TAC Member Monroe commented that clarifications be made that the TIA addresses impacts due to increased traffic.

TAC Member Sharma suggested the following edits:

- 1) Section II, Definition, 1.a., revise to read “Projects that change traffic capacity of the CMP roadway.”;
- 2) Section II, Purpose, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, change “facilities” to “roadways”;
- 3) Section III, 1st paragraph, delete “clear”;
- 4) Section III, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, add “traffic” to read “...used as indicators that a significant traffic impact on a CPM roadway...”.

Other grammatical corrections were also provided.

The TAC unanimously approved the recommendation to advance the TIA to the CMAQ committee with recommendation for the approval of the policy for traffic impact analysis.

## **5. Recommendations for the development of a Traffic Incident Management Plan for the US 101 Corridor.**

Sandy Wong presented a brief recap of the County’s Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) Strategic Plan, which was approved by the Committee, and the resulting recommendations that includes the development of the Incident Management Plan. The development of an Incident Management Plan was identified as a “high priority project.

John Hoang presented on the recommendations to proceed with developing a Traffic Incident Management Plan for the U.S. 101 focusing on establishing emergency bypass routes for major incidents on the freeway. Traffic will be diverted in cases where major incidents on the freeway prevent thru traffic on the freeway for an extensive period. John explained that an incident management plan includes various components such as traffic incident detection, verification, response, site management, traffic management, incident clearing, recovery, and motorist information. This project will focus on the traffic management component.

The project will be divided into two phases; the first phase will be from S.R. 92 to the Santa Clara County line. The second phase will be from the San Francisco County Line to S.R. 92. The development of the plan includes working together with stakeholders and establishing interagency cooperation and coordination. It was recommended that a Working Group be established to provide input in the development of the Plan. The first task will be to establish a project schedule.

The following comments were provided by the TAC members: 1) MTC and Caltrans should be involved also; 2) add the development of emergency bypass routes for I-280 also; 3) incident management is more than just establishing by-pass routes; 4) need to identify infrastructures that will be required; 5) inquire whether Office of Emergency Service already have information regarding alternative routes; 6) KGO radio station may have produced a book that identifies alternative routes already; 7) do not use the word “corridor”; 8) add the CMAQ Committee in the review and approval process; 8) look into whether the CHP has two separate sections that takes care of different portions of the U.S. 101; 9) and consider coordinating with adjacent counties also.

Additional comments and questions pertained to the importance of organization the Working Group and making sure the right agencies are included at the onset. It was suggested that all key agencies and jurisdictions be invited to the initial Working Group meeting and that the group will narrow down as appropriate.

TAC members suggested that Phase I act as the “pilot project” to establish systems and protocols to be used for other phases and locations. Along with developing a schedule, the Working Group will also look into other routes to implement the incident management plans. C/CAG Staff will send an Email to TAC members and other agencies requesting volunteers for the proposed Working Group. The Working Group will generate a project schedule and present to the TAC.

TAC members agreed to proceed with Phase I of the project, as recommend by staff and request staff to report back with a project schedule.

## **6. Measure A Update (Strategic Plan development).**

Joe Hurley, Director of San Mateo County Transportation Authority, presented that the Transportation Authority is in the process of refining the selection and prioritization criteria for projects and programs to be funded by Measure A. Within next couple of weeks, the TA will be sending out fact sheets to each city on highway projects that was submitted by the sponsor city requesting changes and updated information. An email will be sent out to all project sponsors.

## **7. Member Reports.**

Joe reported on the rising cost of construction and sited an example with the City of Half Moon Bay’s recent bid results where the engineer’s estimate was \$10M and the two bids received were over 40% and within \$50,000 of each other. Joe mentioned that TA has secured CTC allocated funding for 101 Auxiliary Lanes between 3<sup>rd</sup> and Millbrae. The current estimate is \$90M and there were some concerns that the cost may increase. Richard Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, added that overages within 15% should be manageable and can be covered with additional funds.

Joe proceeded with a presentation of the recent AASHTO Survey on Construction Cost Increases and Competition – Summary of Responses. The increase in construction cost is being experienced countrywide and we need to be aware of the situation. He also stated that according to the CTC, it is important for agencies to award projects in a timely manner. The adopted policy is that projects need to be awarded within 6 months of the allocation. It is very important that agencies are prepared to award once allocation is made.

Richard Napier, Executive Director of C/CAG, reported on the following items:

- Results from the recent elections shows that none of the five sales tax measures on the ballot passed. Other bonds on the ballot were also defeated. San Mateo County received 75% of the votes when the County's tax measure was part of the last election.
- With regards to bonds, there will be some statewide bonds on the ballot. C/CAG has been lobbying the legislators for bonds related to the STIP. San Mateo County went from approximately \$1M to \$30-\$40M. Polling indicates that transportation bond is polling well, housing is poor, and education is ok.
- Regarding other bond categories relating to the STIP, staff is putting together a list of projects that will qualify for the Corridor Mobility (e.g., major regional projects) funding category. Caltrans will work with the regions to generate lists for the CTC. MTC will be coordinating the regional efforts.
- Another program is the State and Local Partnership program. This program will require a 50/50 match. For San Mateo County, the new bond structure is better than the governor's original proposal. We will work to get the best list of projects together to compete for funding.

Joe also reported that the bond will be called Proposition 1A. There is also a planned Proposition 1B, which is the legislative initiative for the constitutional amendment to protect Prop 42 funds. Proposition 1B will enable the development of a fixed and reliable source of funding for transportation projects and programs. Richard added that there would still be a need for more transportation funding to address the needs.

The meeting adjourned at 2:25 p.m.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** July 20, 2006

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)

**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director

**Subject:** Review of potential candidate projects for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) in the event that voters approve the Senate Bill (SB) 1266 - Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006

(For further information contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) review the potential candidate projects for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA) in the event that voters approve the Senate Bill (SB) 1266 - Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

Funding will be from the Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 if approved by voters on November 7, 2006.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

SB 1266 is subject to voter approval at the November 7, 2006 statewide general election. It would authorize \$19.925 billion of state general obligation bonds for specified purposes, including \$4.5 billion for the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA).

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

The Highway Safety, Traffic Reduction, Air Quality, and Port Security Bond Act of 2006 will be before California voters on November 7, 2006. If approved, it will include \$19.925 billion for high-priority transportation corridor improvements, State Route 99 corridor enhancements, trade infrastructure and port security projects, schoolbus retrofit and replacement purposes, state transportation improvement program augmentation, transit and passenger rail improvements, state-local partnership transportation projects, transit security projects, local bridge seismic retrofit projects, highway-railroad grade separation and crossing improvement projects, state highway safety and rehabilitation projects, and local street and road improvement, congestion relief, and traffic safety.

Of the \$19.925 billion, \$4.5 billion will be in the Corridor Mobility Improvement Account (CMIA). Funding in the \$4.5 billion CMIA will be at the California Transportation Commission's (CTC) discretion based on guidelines to be adopted, and subject to northern and southern California split. The CTC will adopt guidelines for the CMIA by December 1, 2006. Projects nominated for this category shall be submitted to the CTC for consideration by no later than January 15, 2007.

The Bay Area region, including Caltrans, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC), and the nine Bay Area counties have initiated dialogue at the regional level to collaborate on this issue in the event that voters approve.

### **ATTACHMENT**

- San Mateo County Potential Candidate Projects for the Transportation Infrastructure Bond.
- Elements of SB 1266 (Perata/Nunez) Bond Package.
- Bay Area Share of SB 1266 Local Street and Road Funds.



San Mateo County Potential Candidate Projects for the Transportation Infrastructure Bond				
July 20, 2006				
	Description	Total cost	Benefits	Notes
1 SM 101	U.S. 101 Aux lanes from Marsh to Santa Clara County Line	\$105,000,000	Relief congestion, improve travel time, improve air quality.	May be done as part of Project 2.
2 SM 101	U.S. 101 Additional lanes from Marsh to Rte 85 (incl San Antonio I/C)	\$200,000,000	Relief congestion, improve travel time, improve air quality.	Joint project of San Mateo and Santa Clara Counties
3 SM 84	Bayfront Expwy/Willow Rd grade Separations, incl flyover and RR grade sep. Listed in RTP as Dumbarton Bridge Access to US 101.	\$250,000,000	Relief congestion, improve travel time, improve connectivity, improve air quality, improve regional connectivity.	Supported by Santa Clara County
4 SM 101	U.S. 101/Willow Rd Interchange Improvement	\$45,000,000	Improve safety, relief congestion, improve travel time, improve air quality, improve access to jobs.	
5 SM 92	Route 92 Widening and operation improvement from Hwy 101 to Hwy 280	\$90,000,000	Improve safety, improve air quality, improve access to commerce, improve connectivity between rural and urban areas, improve regional connectivity.	
6 SM 92 & 101	Route 92/U.S. 101 interchange operational improvement	\$10,000,000	Relief congestion, improve travel time, improve air quality.	
7 Various locations	Railroad grade separations at various locations	\$90,000,000	Improve safety, improve travel time.	
8 SM 101	U.S. 101/Woodside Interchange Improvement	\$56,000,000	Improve ingress/egress to seaport.	
9 SM 101	U.S. 101/Broadway Interchange Improvement	\$45,000,000	Improve access to airport.	
10 SM 92	Rte 92 Truck Climbing Lane (Route 35 to I-280)	\$90,000,000	Accommodate movements of freight, improve access to markets and commerce.	
11 SM 84	Signal coordination along Willow Rd		Improve travel time, improve air quality	
12 SM 109	Signal coordination along University Ave		Improve travel time, improve air quality	
13 SM 101	US 101 ramp metering from Route 92 to SF County Line			
14 SM 280	I-280 ramp metering from I-380 to SF County Line			
15 SM 280	Install TMS, CCTV, CMS on I-280 SCL Co. Line to SF Co. Line			
16 Various locations	ITS equipment on incident management routes			
17 Various locations	Fiber optic network around the Bay			A Bay Area regional project

<b>Elements of SB 1266 (Perata/Nunez) Bond Package</b>	
<b>Funding Category</b>	<b>Amount (in millions)</b>
Public Transportation Modernization, Improvement and Service Enhancement <sup>1</sup>	\$ 3,600
Intercity Rail	\$ 400
Corridor Mobility <sup>2</sup>	\$ 4,500
State Route 99	\$ 1,000
State Transportation Improvement Program	\$ 2,000
Local Streets and Roads	\$ 2,000
State Highway Operation and Protection Program	\$ 500
Local Streets and Road ITS	\$ 250
State-Local Partnership Program	\$ 1,000
Goods Movement	\$ 2,000
Air Quality - Goods movement	\$ 1,000
Air Quality - School Bus Diesel Retrofit	\$ 200
Transit Security	\$ 1,000
Port Security	\$ 100
Local Match for Bridge Seismic Retrofit	\$ 125
Highway-Railroad Grade Separations	\$ 250
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 19,925</b>
Notes:	
1. Distributed according to the State Transit Assistance formula	
2. Selected by the California Transportation Commission and subject to the north/south split, pursuant to Section 188 of the Streets and Highways Code.	

## Bay Area Share of SB1266 Local Street and Road Funds

*Note: All Numbers are estimates and subject to change*

<b>STATEWIDE AMOUNT</b>	<b>\$ 2,000,000,000</b>		
<b>BAY AREA SHARE</b>	<b>\$ 375,435,420</b>		
<b>DISTRIBUTIONS TO COUNTIES</b>	<b>\$ 167,675,794</b>		
<b>DISTRIBUTIONS TO CITIES</b>	<b>\$ 207,759,626</b>		
<b>DIRECT DISTRIBUTIONS TO COUNTIES</b>	<b>ALLOCATION</b>		
Alameda	\$31,250,390		
Contra Costa	\$24,570,278		
Marin	\$7,381,728		
Napa	\$4,998,243		
San Francisco	\$14,656,034		
San Mateo	\$18,472,879		
Santa Clara	\$38,048,019		
Solano	\$11,375,937		
Sonoma	\$16,922,286		
<b>Region</b>	<b>\$167,675,794</b>		
<b>SAN MATEO</b>			
ATHERTON	\$ 400,000		
BELMONT	\$ 814,868		
BRISBANE	\$ 400,000		
BURLINGAME	\$ 899,824		
COLMA	\$ 400,000		
DALY CITY	\$ 3,330,257		
EAST PALO ALTO	\$ 1,019,315		
FOSTER CITY	\$ 949,959		
HALF MOON BAY	\$ 404,733		
HILLSBOROUGH	\$ 400,000		
MENLO PARK	\$ 976,964		
MILLBRAE	\$ 658,776		
PACIFICA	\$ 1,230,784		
PORTOLA VALLEY	\$ 400,000		
REDWOOD CITY	\$ 2,417,375		
SAN BRUNO	\$ 1,318,981		
SAN CARLOS	\$ 898,013		
SAN MATEO	\$ 2,996,500		
SOUTH SAN FRANCISCO	\$ 1,964,222		
WOODSIDE	\$ 400,000		
<b>COUNTY TOTAL</b>	<b>\$ 22,280,571</b>		

Sources: City calculations provided by the League of California Cities based on population data from January 2006.  
County calculations provided by the California State Association of Counties.

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** April 20, 2006  
**To:** CMP Technical Advisory Committee (TAC)  
**From:** Richard Napier, Executive Director  
**Subject:** Recommendation on the Revised Scoring Criteria to be used for future funding cycle (i.e., Federal STP Local Streets and Road Shortfall)  
(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409 or John Hoang at 363-4105)

---

## **RECOMMENDATION**

That the TAC recommend for approval the Revised Scoring Criteria for determining eligibility and prioritizing project applications for future Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP) Local Streets and Roads Shortfall funding opportunities.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

No fiscal impacts to C/CAG.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

Funds for this program will be from the Federal Surface Transportation Program.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

On April 20, 2006, the TAC recommended that staff reconvene the Scoring Subcommittee to review the scoring and prioritization process for project applications to be submitted for future federal funding opportunities.

A Subcommittee of the TAC was formed with volunteers consisting of Brian Lee, Duncan Jones, Larry Patterson, Mo Sharma, Van Ocampo, Parviz Mokhtari, Ray Razavi, Randy Breault, Sandy Wong and John Hoang. This Subcommittee reviewed the current scoring process and developed a revised scoring criteria taking into account issues raised by both the TAC and CMAQ members.

The new Scoring Criteria was developed and generally agreed to by the Subcommittee. The established criteria were based primarily on technical merits and attempted to maintain objectiveness of the process for evaluating and prioritizing the project applications. Additional issues concerning equity relating to jurisdiction's size, population, and ability to provide matching funds were also discussed. Staff suggests that this issue be addressed further and resolved at the time of the next funding cycle along with other "policy" level decisions and that principle and guidelines be in place before the call for projects process.

The table below summarizes the key issues that were addressed by the Subcommittee and the resulting new point system assignment for each category:

Category/Description	Maximum Points
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USAGE: Considers Average Annual Daily Trips (AADT) and whether a street is on the transit routes or not.</li> </ul>	45
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NEED: Establishes ranking criteria using the Pavement Condition Index (PCI) for specific streets.</li> </ul>	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EQUITY: Derives a formula, “Local Match Dollar divided by Total Lane Miles<sup>1</sup>” to account for smaller jurisdictions with less money.</li> </ul>	15
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• READINESS: Focuses on key factors that determine whether a project is likely ready for advertisement.</li> </ul>	5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LOCAL MATCH: Considers effects of the percentage of matching funds relative to the total project cost.</li> </ul>	20

1. Total lane miles for federally classified routes (i.e., arterials and collectors)

In addition to the above scoring criteria the Subcommittee also agreed to eliminate the “Regionality” component that was previously used because it is accounted for in the AADT factor. Screening factors were also established to determine whether a proposed project is eligible.

## **ATTACHMENT**

- Revised C/CAG Scoring Criteria

# C/CAG SCORING CRITERIA

For Federal Surface Transportation Program (STP)  
Local Streets and Roads Shortfall

Eligibility/Screening Factors:

- Projects must meet all Federal, State, and Regional Requirements
- Federal funds are for construction phase only (does not include PS&E)
- Project is for rehabilitation of streets and roads on the Federal Functional Classification
- Jurisdictions must be in compliance of the Regional Project Funding Delivery Policy requirements at the time of project application.

Category	Description	Points	Maximum Points
Usage	AADT		45
	• < 1000	5	
	• 1001 - 2000	10	
	• 2001 - 3000	15	
	• 3001 - 6000	20	
	• 6001 - 12,000	25	
	• 12,001 - 20,000	30	
	• 20,001 - 30,000	35	
	• > 30,000	40	
	Transit Route		
	• Yes	5	
	• No	0	
Need	Pavement Condition Index (PCI)		15
	• > 70	0	
	• < 40	5	
	• Between 55 and 70	10	
	• Between 40 and < 55	15	
Equity	Local Match Dollars / Total Lane Miles		15
	• 0 - 400	1	
	• 401 - 700	5	
	• 701 - 1200	10	
	• > 1200	15	
Readiness	DBE Approval	2	5
	Environmental Certified	1	
	Right-of-Way Certified or N/A	1	
	Agreements/Permit completed or N/A	1	
Local Match	11.47 % - 19%	5	20
	20% - 29%	10	
	30% to 39%	15	
	40% - 49.9%	20	
<b>Total</b>			<b>100</b>

# C/CAG AGENDA REPORT

**Date:** July 20, 2006

**To:** Technical Advisory Committee

**From:** Sandy Wong

**Subject:** Coordination With Caltrans Regarding Design Features On the El Camino Real -  
(Information Item)

(For further information or questions contact Sandy Wong at 599-1409)

---

## **INFORMATION**

At its June 8, 2006 meeting, the C/CAG Board approved the Joint Principles for Improvements on El Camino Real between Caltrans and C/CAG, and directed staff to work with Caltrans to develop flexibility on design features on the El Camino Real.

As the next step, staff proposes to assist projects sponsors in working with Caltrans to gain acceptance on proposed design concepts.

## **FISCAL IMPACT**

None.

## **SOURCE OF FUNDS**

None.

## **BACKGROUND/DISCUSSION**

There are several on-going programs and projects on the El Camino Real such as the C/CAG El Camino Real Incentive Program, the Grand Boulevard Initiative, various local planning studies such as those in the cities of Redwood City, San Carlos, Belmont, and Colma, TOD Opportunity Study on El Camino Real by SamTrans. There are many issues surrounding these projects on the El Camino Real such as travel speed, lane width, shoulder width, separation distance between the travel land and fixed object (such as a tree), mid-block crossing, bulb-outs, bicycle facilities, sidewalks, signal timing. These issues are interrelated and sometimes mutually conflicting.

Since the recent planning studies in the cities of Redwood City, Belmont, and San Carlos have generated some proposed design concepts for areas in these cities on the El Camino Real, staff proposes to assist the project sponsors in working with Caltrans to gain acceptance on the proposed design concepts. Results from the above may be applied in a broader level in the future.